UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR	15-461				
Plaintiff, v.)	STIPULATED UNDER THE	ORDER EXC SPEEDY TRI	CLUDING LIM AL ACT	LEI	D	
Sacob Ring)			OCT	2 0 2015		
Defendant.	j			SUSAI CLERK, U.S NORTHERN DIS	N Y. SOONO DISTRICT CO TRICT OF CALL	URT	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record Speedy Trial Act from <u>Ochbar 20</u> , 2015 to by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the S161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and	<i>Decemb</i> he public	2015 and the defendar	nd finds that t it in a speedy	cludes time und he ends of justic trial. See 18 U.S	ler the	ii Onnis	
Failure to grant a continuance wor See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ıld be like	ely to result in a r	niscarriage of	justice.			
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).						
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).						
counsel's other scheduled case con	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).						
Failure to grant a continuance wou necessary for effective preparation See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv)	, taking i						
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: Del S	_	United States M	agistrate Judg	grot	5		
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant		Assistant United	States Attorn				